

REMARKS

Claims 1-48 are pending.

Independent claims 1, 4, 20, 25, 28, 29, 42, and 47 are amended.

In the Non-final Office Action mailed on May 16, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). For the reasons set forth in detail below, applicant submits that the present application, including each of the pending claims, is in condition for allowance.¹

The applicants' representative wishes to thank Examiner Gary for the telephone interview on September 13, 2006. During the interview, the parties discussed the applied references Arazi and Martini, the independent claims (including claims 1 and 20, and embodiments of the invention. Further details regarding the substance of the interview may be found below. If Examiner Gary believes that any additional information regarding the interview is necessary, please let the undersigned attorney know.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of Claims 1-48

In the Office Action claims 1-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Arazi et al. (US Pat. No. 6,430,395).

The Examiner also rejected claims 4, 20, 25, 28, 29, 40, and 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by Martini et al. (US Pat. No. 6,675,015).

For a claim to be rejected based on anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), (b), and (e), M.P.E.P. § 2131 requires that: "the reference must teach every element of the claim."

¹ Silence regarding the position taken, or argument made, by the Examiner does not indicate any acquiescence to that position or argument. Furthermore, arguments made with respect to a particular claim or claims apply only to those claim or claims, and not to other claims or patents/applications, unless specifically noted herein.

Arazi deals primarily with mobile station handoff and synchronization between base stations. In Arazi, a base station broadcasts its information to other base stations over a LAN or transmits its information to mobile stations. (See Figure 4; descriptions of Figure 4; Figure 9; descriptions of Figure 9; Figure 15; descriptions of Figure 15; and the Examiner's cited passages.) In contrast to the present claims, Arazi's broadcast or information transmission is neither in reply to another base station's inquiry, nor is it a direct wireless communication with another base station.

Martini deals primarily with mobile handoff in a BluePAC network. In Martini also, a base station sends its information to another base station only through a mobile station. (See Examiner's cited passages.) Again, in contrast to the present claims, this information transmission is neither in reply to the other base station's inquiry, nor is it a direct wireless communication with the other base station.

Neither Arazi nor Martini teach or suggest one base station directly and wirelessly requesting information from another base station and the other base station directly and wirelessly sending back the requested information to be saved and used by the requesting base station. For example, Martini clearly discloses that the mobile station receives and requires information from the base station. (See, e.g., col. 2, lines 51-53 and col. 3, lines 1-6.) Nothing in either Martini or Arazi discloses base stations identifying each other directly.

Aspects of the presently claimed invention are directed more to setting up a wireless network with neighboring base stations locating each other directly. Both Martini and Arazi assume that a wireless network has already been established and base stations already have information regarding each other. Indeed, both Martini and Arazi would benefit from the claimed invention because it could help both of their systems to become more quickly and easily established. See, e.g., page 4 of the present application.

Therefore, a *prima facie* case of anticipation under Section 102 has not been established with respect to these claims and, accordingly, the undersigned requests the

withdrawal of the Section 102 rejection of these claims and their dependent claims 2-3, 5-19, 21-24, 26-27, 30-46, which include the features of these independent claims.

Conclusion

Overall, none of the applied references, singly or in any motivated combination, teach or suggest the features recited in the independent claims, and thus such claims are allowable. Since these independent claims are allowable, based on at least the above reasons, the claims which depend from them are likewise allowable. If the undersigned attorney has overlooked a relevant teaching in any of the references, the Examiner is requested to point out specifically where such teaching may be found.

In view of the foregoing, all of the claims pending in the application are in condition for allowance and, therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-3599.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge shortages or credit overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 340158002US1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: September 15, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Christopher J. Daley-Watson

Registration No.: 34,807

PERKINS COIE LLP

P.O. Box 1247

Seattle, Washington 98111-1247

(206) 359-8000

(206) 359-7198 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant